Also on November 21, 2016, Branagan filed a motion for default judgment (ECF No. 24). 1 2 Apparently, Branagan was unaware that respondents filed an answer on July 5, 2016. The motion 3 for default judgment will be denied. 4 Looking back at respondents' answer, it appears that respondents served the answer on 5 Branagan at LCC after he had been transferred to NNCC, perhaps explaining why Branagan was 6 unaware of it. See Answer (ECF No. 19), p. 17; see also Index of Exhibits (ECF No. 20), p. 3 7 (exhibits served on Branagan at LCC as well). To give Branagan a fair opportunity to reply to 8 respondents' answer, the Court will direct respondents to serve their answer and supporting exhibits 9 on Branagan at his current location, at NNCC, and the Court will grant Branagan time to file a reply. 10 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that petitioner's Application to Proceed in Forma Pauperis (ECF No. 23) is **DENIED** as moot. 11 12 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner's Motion for Default Judgment (ECF No. 24) is **DENIED**. 13 14 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondents shall, within 15 days from the date of this 15 order, serve upon petitioner, at his current location, their answer and the exhibits in support of their answer (ECF Nos. 19, 20, 21, 22), and respondents shall file proof of such service. 16 17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner shall have until March 24, 2017, to file a 18 reply to respondents' answer. 19 November Dated this 30 day of 20 2016. 21 22 23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 24 25 26